India

FOR THE

No. 128. New Series.
No. 222. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JUNE 15, 1900.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 281
The Viceroy's Appeal 284
A Successful Campaign 285
Our London Letter 286
Notes from Bombay 287
The Famine in India:
5,802,000 on Relief 288
The Mansion House Fund 288
The *Investors' Review* Fund 288
An Indian Theatrical Entertainment 288
Appeal by the Viceroy 288
The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: The Minority Report 289
Advertisements 292

NOTES AND NEWS.

The famine persists with increasing general severity, though with diminished force in several districts. The number of persons in receipt of relief, as telegraphed by the Viceroy this week, are 5,802,000—an increase of 32,000 over the week preceding. The chief increases have taken place in the Central Provinces, Ajmere-Merwara, and Rajputana; the largest single decrease (24,000) falls to Bombay. All eyes are now strained for the monsoon. The Viceroy's telegram (June 12) reads hopeful:—

> Monsoon setting in on Malabar Coast (Cape Comorin to Goa) and extending northwards. Indications encouraging. Fair to good general rainfall recently over the Deccan and south, and part of Central Provinces. Good rain has fallen on Orissa Coast (Balasor to Gopalpur).

Everybody will hope that the monsoon will realise the most sanguine expectations. Meantime the famine officials have been busy in preparation of the necessary shelter for the distressed people.

The Mansion House Relief Fund still moves but slowly. It is earnestly to be hoped that the appeal from the Viceroy, which we print and comment upon elsewhere, will give it a much needed impulse, for never was the need for help more urgent. The various local funds appear to be steadily, if not very rapidly, growing; and we should be glad to learn that the suggestion of more special organisation, to which we referred the other week, is getting widely put in practice, so as to secure the contributions of such as are willing to give but "wait to be asked." The Berlin fund is reported to be increasing, and the Berlin correspondent of the *Times* says (June 10) that "the Emperor himself was one of the original contributors, the amount of his Majesty's subscription having been 50,000 marks (£2,500)." It is also reported that the Executive of the New York Chamber of Commerce Committee has sent a second sum of 30,000 dollars (£6,000) to Bombay. Yet the British Government makes no sign of its intention to propose a worthy national contribution. Let us hope that Lord George Hamilton has only been waiting for the re-assembling of the House to make a satisfactory announcement.

In another column we print a letter from Sir William Wedderburn to the editor of the *Investors' Review* on the subject of the disposal of the fund that Mr. Wilson has so sympathetically raised. The first intention had been to devote it to the replacement of the rayat's plough cattle. The Government, however, seems to contemplate generous action in that direction; and the Bombay committee (which includes Mr. Justice Ranade and the Hon. Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta), to which the question was referred, recommend that a portion of the fund should be employed in subsidising two unsectarian orphanages, one at Ahmedabad in Gujerat, and the other at Pandharpur in the Deccan. The balance will await events—particularly the anticipated liberality of the Government to the rayats. Mr. Wilson, it will be seen, agrees that "no better destination could be provided." The Bombay committee meantime express through Sir William Wedderburn their deep gratitude to Mr. Wilson for his "present kindly action," as well as for his "vigorous and continued advocacy of Indian interests."

At the annual meeting of the Women's Liberal Federation, held in London on Wednesday (June 13), Miss Alison Garland moved a resolution, which was carried unanimously, that

> It is desirable, with a view to preventing the frequent recurrence of severe famine in India, that a searching enquiry be made in order to ascertain the economic causes, as distinguished from the physical, of the occurrence of famine in that country.

Miss Garland, in a vigorous and pointed speech, described the condition of the famine districts as seen by herself—"an experience that she would never forget"—and complained that "this country had hardly woke up to its responsibility in the matter."

> What had we done in this country to relieve the distress of the people of India? The Government was spending millions of money, but those millions came out of the Indian coffers and not out of the English Exchequer. The House of Commons had not granted a £5 note towards the relief of the famine, and history would have to record to our shame that the worst famine of the nineteenth century went by without any relief being granted from the Legislative Assembly of the richest Empire in the world. By wiser legislation we could so improve the material prosperity of the Indian rayat that he would have something saved for his day of trial.

Mrs. Mallett, who seconded the resolution, spoke against over-assessment and in favour of full satisfaction of the promises made to India. Miss Garland added that what they wanted was "people who would be as ready to fight famine in India as they were to lay down their lives to take away the freedom of the two Republics in South Africa."

From Ootacamund there comes a story of a very hard case of detention in a segregation camp. A man who had suffered for years from asthma died suddenly. The post-mortem examination showed slight traces of pneumonia and influenza. There were no signs of plague. Yet on his account, and because he might possibly have had plague, no fewer than twenty-four persons were shut up in a segregation camp. Is it any wonder that plague regulations and the officers who have to enforce them are unpopular?

It has been the custom of some Anglo-Indian writers to contrast the efficiency and profusion of famine relief in British territory with the neglect shown by Native States whether in the past or the present. As to the contention that before the advent of the English no public provision was made in India to succour the famine-stricken, it is sufficiently refuted by the Report of the Famine Commission. There is still less ground for charging such Native States as Baroda with neglect at the present time. We read in the *Pioneer*:—

> Thus far the efforts made by the Gaekwar's officers in the Amreli Division to save life have been successful. There are about 45,000 persons on relief works out of a population of 180,000, yet there has been no mortality out of the normal, scarcely any deaths from starvation, and the people are in fairly good condition.

The *Karachi Chronicle* (May 20) states that, "in the matter of the plague policy especially, the local officials have been acting on their own initiative, unmindful of any rules and regulations issued from the Bombay Secretariat," and adduces cases. In view of the unfortunate difficulties and troubles that have arisen in other places out of the plague administration, it is to be hoped that the authorities will examine our contemporary's allegations, and see that their orders are implicitly obeyed. In the same issue of the *Karachi Chronicle* we read some restrained comment upon the proceedings at a meeting of the managing committeee of the Shikarpur Municipality on May 5. Hardened as we are, we confess to amazement. Can it be the fact that a youthful official of less than two years' standing—the President of the Municipality—behaved towards the thirty municipal commissioners in anything approaching the manner described? Finding the sense of the meeting opposed to his own view, he is said to have appealed to

"an influential Mahometan gentleman of great social rank—a Pir," but the Pir "politely insisted" on the other view. Then (the article proceeds) the President

flew into a passion, started from his seat, and called out "Bloody B——" (it is an ugly word, and we feel constrained to omit it from a public print) to the offending Pir. The consternation that followed had better be imagined than described. Three or four Mahometan members left the hall by way of protest. The Bania members in a body prepared to follow suit, when an official member pressed the venerable Pir into his seat, and all was quiet for the nonce.

The President calmed down and apologised to the Pir "for the gross and gratuitous insult." But this, we gather, is not by any means the young gentleman's first performance in this style, and we agree with the *Karachi Chronicle* that "it is nothing short of an outrage on all decency and decorum that objectionable epithets should be used in places where reason and calm reflection might fairly be expected to wield the presidential powers." We trust the authorities will take a very serious view of such intolerable behaviour.

In the Cambridge Mathematical Tripos this year India has but narrowly missed the honour of another Senior Wrangler. Mr. Balak Ram, of St. John's—Mr. Paranjpye's College—has come out fourth wrangler. He was born at Jullundhar, in the Punjab, on April 21, 1876, and was educated at the Government College, Lahore. He is a scholar and a prizeman of St. John's. Another Indian student, Mr. S. C. Roy, has been placed 45th in the list, almost at the top of the Junior Optimes. Mr. Paranjpye has again distinguished himself, gaining a place (with three others, including the Senior Wrangler he was bracketed with) in the first division of the first class in the Part II examination. A test like this affords still more ample confirmation of his conspicuous mathematical ability. Such successes cannot fail to encourage Indian students, as well as to give satisfaction to the friends of the successful candidates and to do credit to India.

Lord Stanley of Alderley, who has long taken a close interest in Indian affairs, has addressed a long letter to the *Morning Post* (June 11) on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and its handling of Indian appeals. "The appeal," he points out, "is to a tribunal only one member of which has had any Indian judicial experience at all"—and at present that member is Sir Richard Couch. Lord Stanley recites the points of several cases illustrating the grounds of recent dissatisfaction. What does he propose by way of remedy? He says:—

The appointments to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council are governed by the following Acts of Parliament: 1833-4 of William IV, and 1871-2, 1876-7, 1877-8, of Victoria. These Acts give the Privy Councillors or Indian assessors very various salaries, ranging from £400 a year to £5,000 and £6,000. . . . If Mr. Chamberlain's scheme became law, there would be great danger that, while the great Colonies would be able to protect themselves, India would be practically helpless, and that the efficiency of the judge for Indian appeals might be sacrificed to home conveniences; and it has been suggested to me that it would be better, instead of spending £6,000 a year on one assessor, to spend it in creating six assessors in place of the two created by the Act of 1833. I fully agree with this view, that they would be more useful and more appreciated in India than one ornamental Lord of Appeal who may or may not know anything about them. The larger number would ensure a greater amount of experience and more varied knowledge of different parts of India and of the different schools of law.

Lord Stanley concludes that "perhaps the best means of strengthening the Privy Council for Indian Appeals, without waiting for any change in the law, would be to appoint another judge by filling up the vacancy under section 30 of the Act of William IV, and, in order to ensure experience, he should be chosen from one of the retired chief justices of the three Presidencies."

We must, with regret, but with decision, at once say that we entirely disagree with Lord Stanley. Of course, if the Government choose to neglect the principle of appointing the best available man to the post and foist on the Indian people an "ornamental Lord of Appeal who may or may not know anything about them," the matter is open to a severely adverse criticism, and there is an end of the question. But we must assume that the Government will not for a moment contemplate any such atrocity. No doubt half-a-dozen assessors from half-a-dozen provinces of India would bring to the counsels of the Committee a greater amount of experience and more varied knowledge of different districts and of the different schools of law. But surely this project is wholly chimerical. Even if the Government were ready and willing to appoint six assessors, where is the possibility of obtaining six adequate candidates? No Indian worthy of the post would dream of renouncing his income and his native land for £1,000 a year. But one good man is amply sufficient for all the present purposes. A first-rate Indian barrister has an adequate grasp of the principles of all the systems of law, and an adequate knowledge of the ways of his countrymen; and he would have plenty of opportunity to fill up any gaps of detail, which might emerge in any given case. He would certainly be far better equipped for his work than any one, or any three, retired Chief Justices. What is wanted is a man, not only of Indian blood, but of a different intellectual calibre from the class of Chief Justices, every one of whom, from the very nature of the case, is drawn from the third and fourth and lower rates of barristers at home. There could be no more profound blunder than to appoint an ex-Chief Justice, or not to appoint an Indian of professional eminence and popular sympathies.

Sir Richard Couch, we understand, is going to retire. He has almost completed his eighty-third year, but still he is hale and hearty. He has been a judge for almost forty years, having been appointed to the Bombay bench in 1862. He was Chief Justice of Bombay from 1866 to 1870, and Chief Justice of Bengal from 1870 to 1875. For nineteen years—since 1881—he has been a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It is undesirable to revive now any of the controversies over his Indian judgments, which have recently fallen under criticism. An honourable, patient, and painstaking judge, he has yet scarcely succeeded in impressing his colleagues of the Judicial Committee within his special sphere. It used to be remarked that, while Lord Watson never omitted to discuss any substantial point in a case, Sir Richard Couch rigidly confined himself to just so much as was necessary to found his judgment. This ingrained reticence, it is to be feared, has crippled his powers for the enrichment of the exposition of Indian law to the full extent of his opportunities. At the same time Sir Richard has proved himself a good friend of Indian reforms, and recently he was one of the signatories to the memorandum in favour of the separation of judicial and executive functions. All good wishes will follow him into his well-earned retirement.

The Resolution of the Government of the North-West Provinces on the Cawnpore riots contains some points that should be noted. There is evidence in the history of one plague case, the last of the five, that the best and most popular regulations may be perverted in execution. A young man named Bansi was found to be suffering from plague. As he was living in a small single-storied building in a populous suburb, isolation in his own dwelling was impossible. Captain Selby, the officer on special plague duty, therefore ordered his removal to a neighbouring grove where suitable accommodation could be readily provided for him. The civil surgeon, however, insisted on the transfer of the patient to the plague camp three miles off, and there he died on the next day. The resolution goes on to say:—

In the Lieutenant-Governor's opinion it was most unfortunate that Captain Selby's advice was not acted upon. . . . If the young man Bansi had been segregated near his home, ... where all his friends could in accordance with Rule 35 of the Plague Regulations have had easy access to him, much of the misapprehension, suspicion and panic which arose from this case might probably have been avoided. The Lieutenant-Governor had no doubt the local officers acted for the best, but they misjudged the temper of the people, and missed their opportunity.

The unpopularity produced by this case rapidly developed. The celebration of the *Bakra Id* showed an unusually friendly feeling between Hindus and Mahometans. The latter sacrificed no cows, while the former dispensed sherbet. Then a rumour spread that a child had been kidnapped and taken to the plague camp. In the opinion of the Commissioner the child actually was kidnapped by those who wished to lend colour to the rumour. The rest of the story as told by the Resolution is already well known, though it is interesting to observe that the authorities charge the police with slackness and ineptitude rather than with blackmailing and corruption.

As a result the city, with the exception of some individuals and classes held to be blameless, will have to pay Rs. 50,000 a-year for additional police.

The *Friend of India* sees in the Resolution on the Chupra case evidence that the agitation for the separation of judicial and executive functions has had some effect, but it is still unable to decide what the views of the Government are. Up to some forty years ago, this confusion of functions was always spoken of as the great blot on our system of Government in India. Thus Sir Frederick Halliday in 1838 said :—

The first and most prominent defect of our system I take to be the union of executive and judicial functions in a magistrate.

These views he recanted in 1856, and by 1868 the opposite opinions had become generally prevalent in the official world. It was thought that the knowledge of his judicial powers would strengthen the magistrate in his executive capacity, or in other words that the people would believe that he would use his judicial powers to forward his executive ends. Such a belief might strengthen the individual official. In the long run, it could not fail to weaken the Government.

The details of the case of Sohoni *v.* Rowcraft are now to hand, though the trial took place some time ago. Our readers will remember that Captain Rowcraft assaulted an elderly Indian schoolmaster named Sohoni, because he did not salaam when passing him on the public road. After attempting to obtain redress through official channels, Mr. Sohoni brought a civil action and has obtained 200 rupees damages. The defendant admitted "foolishness and hastiness," and the Judge held that the plaintiff gave him no provocation by failing to salaam.

Chola Khan, a Tarsil peon employed at the Paraswara Famine Relief Camp, displeased the Relief Officer. The sahib, therefore, attempted to horsewhip him, and on his running away got his servants to seize and thrash him. He was then ordered to climb a mango tree, and when he had done so the sahib threatened to shoot him if he did not stand upright. The man lost his balance, fell to the ground, broke his fore-arm and injured his thigh, and was taken to the hospital. The *Tribune* avers that the police report agrees almost exactly with the above account, which is taken from the written complaints of the victim.

The insolence which characterises some Europeans in their dealings with Indians has a way of spreading to their Indian servants. An *ekka* belonging to a European was lately brought before the Vice-Chairman of the Tikari Municipality, who is also Head-Master of the Tikari High School, because its license had not been paid for. The servant in charge of the *ekka* was very insolent and it was distrained, the horse being sent to the pound. Soon after the master, not to be outdone by his servant, arrived on the scene, abused the Vice-Chairman in Hindustani and English, while his peons held the object of his abuse for fear he should get away. We take this case from the *Tribune*.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* has some strong remarks on the treatment of the Mundah rioters. Two hundred and seventeen have been in prison for five months, yet Mr. Jacob, the counsel for the defence, could not discover on what charge. Worse still, when he applied for bail to be allowed to 93 of them, the Police Sub-Inspector came forward and laid non-bailable charges against 67 of these —charges which had not been heard of before. The Magistrate fixed the bail of the others so high that they had to remain in prison.

The *Pioneer* has an amusing article, headed "Juggling with Figures," on the value of statistics relating to wild beasts in India. The return showing the result of measures adopted for the destruction of wild animals and venomous snakes in the Punjab begins with columns in which are to be recorded the ravages of elephants and the rewards given for their destruction, but there seem to be no wild elephants in the Province. Tigers are said to have increased 400 per cent. and killed one cow. Wolves, over large districts, though providing an income for those who took part in their destruction, were apparently vegetarian. Still more curious is it that with the cessation of the rewards for killing snakes, those reptiles have given up attacking cattle and almost ceased to hurt men. On the whole, the return makes us rather doubtful of the value of the elaborate statistical information furnished by the Government of India.

General Currie has written a book entitled "Below the Surface," in which he makes use of his long Indian experience to blacken the character of Indian officials; but unlike others he does not shirk from the necessary conclusion to which this leads. The English official administers the country through Indians, amid Indians, and with little knowledge of the people save that gained from Indians. Therefore if the subordinate officials are corrupt the whole edifice must be rotten. It is a curious result of these views, now so prevalent among Anglo-Indians, that the vindication of the success of English rule in India is left to the friends of the Congress. General Currie has a strong dislike to our system of coded law, from which the rayat gets law but not justice; hence his growing distrust of his rulers.

In the May number of the *Indian Review* Professor J. G. Jennings, of Muir College, Allahabad, offers suggestive criticisms on the disposal of Mr. Tata's munificence for the wise promotion of research. He deprecates the insertion of "Research" in the title of the proposed institution :—

For if there is to be a special University of Research, what are the existing universities to be? Research should be a characteristic of all universities worthy of the name. A genuine teaching university must be a University of Research.

This is somewhat of the nature of a "pious opinion," however, and the essential matter is to establish the new foundation in the most fruitful relations with the existing institutions of learning. The result of Professor Jennings's argument would be apparently a complete remodelment of the scheme. He says :—

That no Indian university either adequately conducts research at present or teaches or is really worthy of the name of university is an unfortunate fact which will, in the opinion of not a few, become the less remediable if a special University of Research is to be raised above their heads. In opposition to Mr. Tata's real and avowed wishes his new foundation so-named would depress the existing institutions, and help to condemn them permanently to their present position as mere examining bodies. Let, then, Mr. Tata's munificence refound on truer lines an existing university, whether that of Bombay or one of the rivals of Bombay, rather than overtop them all by a new University of Research.

But why not reform the universities so as to work up, in reasonable time, to Mr. Tata's ideal? Professor Jennings's suggestions are well worth consideration, but his experience seems to be too exclusively Oxonian, or English. He is useful as a critic, but as a guide he needs himself to be criticised.

The *Indian Review*, published by the enterprise of Mr. G. A. Natesan of Madras, gives excellent promise of usefulness. The first half-dozen numbers exhibit a wide variety of topics and a bright and effective treatment. We trust that the initial energy will be steadily maintained, so as to render the *Review* a potent instrument of information and discussion. The print is good, and the get-up is attractive. The new monthly ought to receive a wide and warm welcome.

Our Continental neighbours are following with close interest the unfolding of our apparent embarrassments in outlying provinces of the Empire, and India comes in for her share of attention. There will probably be as much surprise as gratification to the readers of *La Petite République* (June 6) in a communication from Mr. H. M. Hyndman, which is headed *L'Inde Saignée à Blanc* ("The Bleeding to Death of India"), and which exposes British Indian misgovernment and maladministration through two close-printed columns. Mr. Hyndman sets forth in lucid array and with unsparing fidelity the main facts of the famine situation, the real causes of the deplorable condition of the country, and the startling contrast between the actual results of a mistaken policy and the results that would naturally flow from a policy of true statesmanship. He does not hesitate to affirm that the Government is doing its utmost to prevent the truth as to the famine, and particularly as to the famine mortality, from being known in England. The lamentable results of the general policy of the Government he attributes to the deliberate and direct action of the governing classes of England. The article is a reassertion and enforcement of the "bleeding theory" in uncompromising terms.

THE VICEROY'S APPEAL.

THE urgency of the terrible famine in India will not be denied. The calamity refuses to be put off even by the exigencies of the war in South Africa. So far back as January 19 the Viceroy raised the note of alarm in his Council Chamber. Four days later the Lord Mayor of London responsively addressed the Secretary of State on the subject of opening a Mansion House Famine Relief Fund, and after a week's apparent meditation the Secretary of State consented to the proposal, but delayed the inauguration of the Fund till the middle of February, so as to constitute it a branch of the Viceroy's Indian Famine Relief Fund, which was to be formally opened at Calcutta on February 16. For reasons that we have amply set forth, the Lord Mayor's Fund lagged, and on April 2 Lord George Hamilton addressed to the Lord Mayor a Further Memorandum (not made public till April 9, a week after date), which was substantially another appeal to the benevolence of the British public. Still, as we have painfully marked week after week, the Lord Mayor's Fund crept up with lamentable slowness, and even yet it has just barely exceeded one-half of the amount collected through the same agency in 1897-98. Now (June 11) the Lord Mayor has received an urgent appeal—the third of the appeals—from the Viceroy himself, dated Simla, May 23. We print the full text of the Viceroy's letter in another column, and we earnestly hope that the public will at last realise the pressing need of our Indian fellow-subjects, and come forward with worthy assistance in their awful calamity.

The Viceroy, it will be seen, recalls the munificent response of the British nation to the appeal addressed to them three years ago, when the famine then raging was justly described as the worst of the recorded famines of the century. And now he sets out a summary of facts intended to impress the sense that the present famine vastly exceeds in extent and in intensity the preceding awful visitation. Thus, he points out that, while the average Indian rainfall, calculated for the past thirty years, is forty-one inches, the deficiency in 1896 was five inches, and in 1899 it was eleven inches, or 27 per cent.—a deficiency without parallel in Indian records. The area affected by famine was, in the middle of May, 1897, 205,000 square miles, while in the middle of May, 1900, it was 417,000 square miles (or nearly one-fourth of the entire extent of the Indian Empire); and the population of the respective areas was 40,000,000 as against 54,000,000. These figures indicate sufficiently the wider prevalence of the present famine, yet they seem to require some explanation. For Lord George Hamilton, in his Further Memorandum of April 2, stated that the affected tracts "contain a population of 85 millions, of whom perhaps 62 millions may be severely affected." He went on to explain that "of the 85 millions, 43½ are inhabitants of Native States, and 41¾ millions are in British territory." Apparently, then, what is to be understood is that these 41¾ millions have grown to 54 millions. But there must be a similar growth in the Native States, bringing the previous 43½ millions considerably over 54 millions. In that case Lord Curzon's estimate would not conflict with Lord George Hamilton's (which was, of course, Lord Curzon's), or with the independent estimates, more or less guided by official reports, which have indicated a population of quite 100 millions, or one-third of the entire population of India, as in the grasp of famine. In like manner, the numbers on relief in May, 1897, were 3,811,000, while in May, 1900, they were reckoned at 5,607,000. The vastly more formidable state of things in the present famine is vividly depicted in these enormous figures. In another form also Lord Curzon strives to bring home to the minds of the British public the magnitude and the exacting character of the task imposed on the famine officials. He points out that no less than 15 per cent. of the population of the afflicted regions in British India, and no less than 6 per cent. in the Native States, are at the present moment dependent upon Government support. Here is a condition of society that hopelessly transcends any experience within the three Kingdoms. The calamity is beyond the mental grasp, and can only be vaguely appreciated. But there is no reason why it should not be appreciated sufficiently to evoke a worthy demonstration of practical sympathy. Yet Lord Curzon has to point out explicitly that the generosity of the United Kingdom in these terrible circumstances is little more than half what it was in the greatly less calamity of three years ago.

Now need we ask, yet again, how comes it to pass that the Viceroy of India is reduced to the necessity of making such a pitiable appeal? No one that has glanced at our columns can hesitate to assign the real cause. Not for a moment can it be justly alleged that the people of this country are more indifferent to the distress of their Indian fellow-subjects than they were three years back. To a certain extent, indeed, it cannot well be doubted that the benevolence of many has been concentrated on South Africa; but it is scarcely credible that the diversion of such occasional rivulets has very materially affected the general stream of charity. Nor can it be said that the people are unaware of the grave need in India; they may not have been able to obtain much detailed information, but the weekly figures of distress alone must have apprised them of the necessity of large assistance. Nor do we suppose for a moment that the contributions of the charitable have suffered diminution by reason of any opinion that the Government or the Government officers have been remiss either in preparation or in execution of the measures of relief. We have ourselves frankly offered criticism on points and in cases where we thought criticism was imperatively called for, but we have explicitly acknowledged our belief that the famine officials have been doing their very best to combat the manifold distresses of the people. We rejoice to note the generous testimony of the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas Parakh in favour of the sympathy, self-sacrifice, and industry of the officials of all grades in the severely stricken districts of Gujerat, and we have very special pleasure in drawing attention in another column to the weighty and independent evidence of the special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* as to the capable conduct of the famine operations in the Central Provinces. Lord Curzon declares that "Government is straining every nerve, is pouring out its money, is shrinking from no obligation, however severe." He enters into general details, and then re-states the well-known ground of his appeal to private benevolence:—

> From October, 1899, the beginning of the famine, until December, 1900, we anticipate that we shall have spent 5¼ millions sterling upon direct relief, 2 millions upon suspensions and remissions of Land Revenue, 1¼ millions upon advances (that will, in many cases, never be recovered) for the purchase of seed and cattle, ¾ million upon loans to distressed Native States. But over and above this expenditure, which cripples our development in a score of ways, there lies a vast area of need, which, do what we may, we can barely reach, and in which extraneous contributions supply an invaluable reinforcement. I may instance the relief of the aged and infirm, of sick patients in the hospitals, of children and orphans, of those men and women who will endure almost any privation sooner than submit themselves to the quasi-publicity of Government relief. This is a field of enormous and almost undiscoverable extent, the margin of which the already over-worked official hardly touches, but which is, in a peculiar and inevitable degree, the property of individual effort and private generosity.

Undoubtedly there is much in this statement that may form a just ground of appeal, and that is accepted as ample reason for generous consideration. But there are other points that it is futile to persist in ignoring.

The fact is that the essential fault lies, not with the British public, but with the highest authorities. The public are as docile and responsive as any statesman could desire; but they refuse to be played with. They are ready and willing to contribute their pounds and their pence, but they require first to be treated with open fairness and to be taken into confidence. Lord George Hamilton tells them that the means and credit of India are amply sufficient for all contingencies in sight, and that the Home treasury is open to him when the Calcutta treasury is exhausted; and they take him at his word. He produces a Budget and boasts of a surplus of two millions and a half, and the Press, Liberal as well as Tory, with but few exceptions, and with very few leading exceptions indeed, raises a deafening chorus of exultation over the "elasticity" and the general "prosperity" of India; and again the people take him at his word. The evident sense of the House of Commons, expressed by Sir William Wedderburn, backed up by Sir Henry Fowler and other members of Indian experience and knowledge, is indicated in favour of a substantial national contribution to the specifically charitable side of the relief work, though not intended as charity but as a token of sympathy in distress and of appreciation of the marked display of Indian loyalty and interest in British success in South Africa, and

Lord George Hamilton disclaims the necessity, discourages the benevolent intention, and offers a problematical alternative of exiguous dimensions; and once more the people take him at his word. The special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, reports the dismal and oppressive operation of the reduced minimum wage, and the absurd and heartless collection of revenue in the midst of universal distress in the Bombay Presidency; and by and by there occurs to the charitable public here the same idea as occurred to him, "that there is a certain hardness in expecting the public to provide an indemnity, as it were, for governments whose reckless collecting has plunged the people into ruin." It need hardly be added that the public here have not been furnished with such information as they are clearly entitled to, and that on an excuse that is palpably insufficient, and even contemptuous.

Here lies the radical mistake—the fatal blunder. From the first, the people ought to have been taken into the confidence of the Government, and supplied with adequate information as to the real state of affairs. The persistent reason against this course, as we have often stated, is the dread of home interference. But home interference, we regret to acknowledge, is not so very lively as to be excited by a national gift in a time of dire need. And in any case home interference will become a more and more dangerous contingency the longer it is postponed. But, as we said last week, we hope the people will in the first place and at once respond liberally to the appeal of the Viceroy, who, by the way, is winning himself golden opinions among the Indian populations, and then, when the stress is over, hold the India Office to a severely strict account.

A SUCCESSFUL CAMPAIGN.

It has fallen to our duty to point out many deficiencies in the system of famine relief adopted, to reprobate the sacrifice of everything else to the necessity of economy, to defend the Indian people from the calumnies by which it was sought to justify this niggardly policy, and to place before our readers the distressing story of suffering unfolded before our eyes by the press of England and India. In particular we have had from time to time to call attention to the letters of the special correspondents of the *Times of India* and the *Manchester Guardian*, which (in spite of the marked inclination of the former to support the Government) contained many records of inadequacy and failure. The correspondent of our great Lancashire contemporary has been unsparing in his exposure of the parsimony that has characterised some of the work in the Bombay Presidency. So much the more effective is his praise, when it is freely given. It is a great pleasure to us to be able to put before our readers the strong, but measured, praise which he gives to the campaign against famine in the Central Provinces. Those Provinces have had much to contend against; for they lie under untoward conditions of settlement, and they have been swept within three years by the full force of two of the greatest famines known in history. But they have been fortunate in this, that their destinies in this terrible crisis have been in the hands of a Chief Commissioner capable of realising the full import of the situation, ready to use all the resources at his disposal for the succour of the people, and with the power of imparting something of his own enthusiasm to his subordinates. Respected by all races, resolute to do his duty, he has found in this disastrous famine a great opportunity which he has known how to use.

The Central Provinces had barely recovered from the famine of 1897 when they found themselves plunged into one of even greater intensity. Out of a population of ten and three-quarter millions inhabiting the famine-stricken districts, a million and three-quarters were on Government relief when the special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* wrote on May 22 last, and the numbers were still rising. There is, it is true, less of a fodder and a water famine than in some other parts of India, but in Raipur, the great rice-growing district, 600,000 or 40 per cent. of the people were on relief, and in Bilaspur a quarter of a million. But striking as these figures are, still more striking is another set of figures; for in the very midst of famine, until the appearance of cholera a very short time ago, the death-rate was normal. Here is the opinion of the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*:—

> It is impossible to speak too highly in praise of the relief work which has been carried on ever since the autumn. In the famine of 1897 the Government were too late and a heavy toll was paid before measures of relief could be organised; but the lesson has been well learned, and directly the failure of the autumn crops declared itself a systematic campaign was organised by the Chief Commissioner and pushed forward twenty-four hours ahead of every movement of the enemy. The campaign has no doubt been costly, and it has absorbed an army of organisers, but on the other hand it has kept the people from starvation, and when the monsoon bursts the two millions of agriculturists will be in good heart and trim for getting their farms in hand again.

Here then we have as the characteristics of famine relief in the Central Provinces, first promptitude, secondly, a careful but generous expenditure; and as a result, the people will be ready to face the world again very little the worse for their terrible experiences. "The famine in these parts has emphatically not been run on the cheap." In regard to the labour problem:

> The policy of the famine authorities has been to exact a fair task from the people, and to do this it was necessary to have competent supervision, and enough of it, to see that the camps were not so large as to endanger discipline, and to hit upon a means of payment that would give the people a clear idea of the relations between work and wages.

It was decided for these purposes never to have camps of more than 6,000 persons, and to pay wages daily and in such relation to the work done as all could recognise. The great majority of the people are earning the maximum wages, they are "in good heart and good condition," and a vast addition has been made in the shape of tanks, roads, etc., to the permanent wealth of the Provinces. "That the policy," adds the correspondent, "will prove itself really costly in the long run, I venture to doubt."

But the advocates of restriction of relief, even at the cost of human life, have not been content to rest their case wholly on the poverty of India and the impossibility of the country bearing so great an expenditure. That would point too irresistibly to a grant from the Treasury of the United Kingdom. So they take a high moral ground and declare that the lavish expenditure on the last famine tended to pauperise the people, that thousands who have other means of subsistence flock to the relief works, and that all the honourable modesty of the old Indian character is falling away before the temptation held out by the luxurious treatment of those in receipt of Government relief. It may be interesting to see how far the letter before us bears out this contention. The correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* finds that the chief desire of the people themselves is to get back to their homes as soon as may be. In the Hoshangabad division,

> out of half-a-million of people only 60,000 are on relief; the rest are living on the remains of the scanty harvest which they were able to reap this spring. But it is a hard and anxious business, a painful race against time and the rains, and the people's faces speak eloquently of what they have had to endure. They have eaten their seed grain, and for months they have been living on half or rather less than half rations, for which in many cases they have had to go in debt to the landlord. Their credit with the money-lender is exhausted, and the women's ornaments were sold or pledged in the famine of 1897. Yet with relief works within easy walking distance whole villages are fighting it out together.

This does not look as if the people were demoralised, or were only awaiting an opportunity to obtain relief from the Government. Even if there are a few who still have some resources left, these will not be wasted. They will be used in the period between the bursting of the monsoon and the ripening of the crops—a period of hope and yet of distress to which the thoughts of those on the works are continually turning and for which a few even manage to save out of their scanty rations. But in the opinion of some who speak with the highest authority it is better that a certain number should be admitted to the works though not absolutely destitute than that the risk should be run of bringing the really needy to a state of starvation.

The authorities in the Central Provinces have had two difficulties to deal with, one unfortunately found elsewhere, but the other peculiar to that district. The first is the cholera, which has broken out at many of the relief works. But though the cholera was found here as elsewhere, its effects were very different, for here the patients were cheerful, confident, and above all in good condition, so that they could make a brave fight for their lives. The cholera will probably grow worse as the pools in the river beds grow smaller and the water in the wells grows muddier.

> Worst of all, when the monsoon breaks next month—for everyone assumes that there will be no failure this year—the first swirl of the waters will carry death in every direction, and where the famine

administration has been run on hard and grudging lines and the people are weakened and disheartened the pestilence will have things its own way. Down here in the Central Provinces the relief has been organised with such grasp and thoroughness, and the whole famine service is drilled to such a point of efficiency that the prospect may be faced with something like composure.

And then we have a comparison with the very different state of things in Bombay. But what is especially striking in the story of the advent of cholera in the relief camps, is the composure with which so dread a visitor is received. The correspondent tersely gives the reason: "as the people have confidence in the officials, there is no panic."

The other and peculiar difficulty is the presence of a large population in a lower state of civilisation than their neighbours. The jungle-covered mountains are the homes of the Gonds and Koorkors, who remained unassimilated by the civilisation of the Hindus. Among them, too, there has been no starvation. They have flocked to the relief camps, and in return for the food they have received there, they have done a quantity of good honest work—"a splendid achievement" on the part of the Government, as is pointed out in the letter before us. Thus the famine relief reaches alike the peasantry of the plains, "an amazing folk, patient, resourceful, and thrifty beyond belief," and also the wild men of the hills, and these, too, have been induced to give their labour in return.

In this fair picture the correspondent finds but one blemish. There has happily been no lack of fodder in the Central Provinces while elsewhere this has been one of the most serious elements in the situation. In the one place Government fodder cut and uncut is going begging, while in the Punjab, in Rajputana, and in Gujerat, "the last of the beasts are dying of hunger." The Government are paying the people to get rice from Bengal or Burmah and the grain dealers and the railways find it worth their while to bring the rice to those who want it. But it is different with the cattle. Whose fault is this? Partly that of the Government, who in the beginning charged too high a price for the fodder; partly that of the railways, who do not provide the means of carriage. Even now when the price is reduced, the railway companies will not provide sufficient trucks. "Surely," says the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, "it would have been better to spend some money and energy in saving the cattle, even at the risk of annoying the railway companies, than to fall back on loans for buying fresh cattle, if, indeed, they are anywhere to be got." On the preservation of the cattle depends the future of Indian agriculture.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

PARLIAMENT reassembled to-day after the Whitsuntide recess with nerves composed to a state of lethargy. A fortnight ago the air was electric; to-day it is deceptively serene. All the talk of an impending dissolution has been silenced. Members pooh-pooh the idea, and declare that for themselves they never gave it a moment's consideration. They admit the possibility of an autumn dissolution, but are more inclined to put their money on a spring one. The explanation of this sudden change of front is to be found in the position of affairs in South Africa. Pretoria has been occupied, yet the war is still raging. The British flag flies over the Raadzaal, but the Boers are capturing British regiments. Although there is no longer a Free State, the Free Staters have succeeded in isolating Lord Roberts. A fugitive from his capital, President Kruger is still as determined, still as sanguine, still as well-armed as before. People at home do not allow those hindrances to shake their confidence in the ultimate success of the British arms, but everyone recognises that until the conflagration has been brought under control the Government dare not think of appealing to the constituencies. A single disaster, occurring at a critical period of the election, might play havoc with a whole army of Ministerial candidates.

Almost as interesting as the military situation is the singular crisis that has suddenly arisen in the political affairs of South Africa. Mr. Schreiner has fallen out with his colleagues and has tendered his resignation to Sir Alfred Milner. Strange to say his action has evoked expressions of the deepest regret from the Imperialist press. A few weeks ago the very writers who are now fawning on Mr. Schreiner were demanding his dismissal. To-day their distress at his resignation is only modified by the reflection that Sir Alfred Milner has appealed to him to continue to act temporarily as Prime Minister. Mr. Schreiner's justification has come sooner than might have been expected. The celerity with which his detractors have been converted suggests that the political situation in Cape Colony must be one of extreme danger. At all events it is obvious that the Ministerial organs in the press have had a hint from some high authority to moderate the violence of their campaign against Afrikanderdom. Their eyes have been almost miraculously opened to the statesmanlike qualities of Mr. Schreiner's policy of neutrality and they are now actually imploring him not to relinquish his patriotic task. Mr. Schreiner's brother-in-law, who has been chiefly occupied of late in dodging Unionist half-bricks, may yet be fêted at a Unionist banquet.

Future controversy with regard to the two Boer States will be chiefly concerned with the terms of settlement. Little or no resistance to the policy of annexation is to be expected from the Opposition. Indeed, that policy is already, to a certain extent, an accomplished fact. Greatly to the astonishment of international jurists, the Free State has been annexed by virtue of a simple proclamation from Lord Roberts. The absorption of the Transvaal will doubtless be decreed in the same primitive, not to say lawless, manner. But whether the thing is done with due formality or as if it were a mere incident in military routine it would seem to be inevitable. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman acknowledges that there is no feasible alternative, and Mr. John Morley gives the dictum his sombre assent. Here and there a few Liberals, led by one Liberal Unionist—Mr. Leonard Courtney—are to be found stoutly contending for a reversion to the *status quo ante bellum*, but they are a hopeless minority. In the House of Commons, for instance, they might be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Opinion, however, is more equally divided on the subject of the future administration of the conquered territories. Mr. Chamberlain is eager to give them the character of a Crown Colony. He could only do this, of course, on the pretext that the scheme was of a temporary nature. It would be too absurd to celebrate the successful conclusion of a war for the franchise by completely abolishing the principle of representative government. Accordingly, the Crown Colony scheme will doubtless be put forward as a means of bridging the interregnum between the period of military occupation and the return of the country to its normal condition. A good many Liberals distrust the proposal. Both Mr. Morley and Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman have indicated that they would prefer a prolongation of military rule to a hastily devised system of civil government. The former could not possibly be permanent, whereas the latter might be. They therefore urge that the Government should take time to consider the question of administration, and while Mr. Morley is evidently convinced that the evil cannot be averted the leader of the Opposition has clearly foreshadowed the probability of a strong resistance to cut-and-dried schemes of bureaucratic government. Under the circumstances it is by no means improbable that Lord Salisbury may dissolve on this question. Mr. Chamberlain has repeatedly threatened the Opposition with the pains and penalties of a dissolution in the event of a too presumptuous criticism of his administrative genius.

Two more months of possible activity remain to our legislators before the present Session runs its course. They will probably be as barren as the four months that have gone. Foreign complications always stifle domestic reforms, and at the present moment we are threatened by troubles on every hand. The famine in India will probably not pre-occupy the attention of Parliament to an embarrassing extent, but there is every indication of a renewal of the acrimonious Chinese debates which consumed so much time in the Session of 1898. Moreover, the Ashanti difficulty is visibly growing. Were it not for the already depleted state of the Indian garrisons, the dangerously undermanned condition of the West African stations, and the immature physique of the troops left to us at home, we should have witnessed before now the organisation of a formidable army to crushthe revolt at Kumasi. Delay is proving dangerous. Already we know that the advance of the relief column has been checked, and at any moment we may receive still graver intelligence. Altogether, it will be seen that, although the remainder of the Session may not be productive of legislation, that is not to say that Parliament will have nothing to talk about.

A belated awakening of the public conscience to the claims of India would almost appear to be in progress. The subject has occupied more space in the columns of the London press within the last few days than at any previous period in the lamentable history of the famine. Lord Curzon's vivid letter to the Lord Mayor seems to have aroused many people to a sense of the realities of the situation, and it will doubtless have the further effect of strengthening the movement for a grant from the Imperial Treasury. A resolution calling attention to the needs of the people was adopted the other day by the Women's Liberal Federation. *Punch*, always a champion of charitable causes, makes lyrical appeal this week to the compassion and liberality of Englishman on behalf of their fellow-subjects in the East, while other journals urge the necessity of Government action. It is to be hoped that this sympathy may crystallise in some enduring form.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

DEMONSTRATIONS OF LOYALTY.

THE CAWNPORE RIOT.

THE CURRENCY MUDDLE AGAIN.

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, May 26.

The relief of Mafeking, after its heroic defence for over six months, has invested this year's anniversary of the birthday of our Sovereign Lady with unusual enthusiasm in India. At the Presidency capitals, as well as in many a leading town, the demonstrations in honour of the auspicious day were of an interesting character. There have been "at homes" by the English community, "harikirtans" and other forms of thanksgiving by the Hindus, prayers and alms by the Mahometans, and similar expressions of devotional joy by other minor classes of the Indian population. Neither have the Princes and Chiefs in Feudatory India been backward in their demonstrations of loyalty to the aged Sovereign. Whatever may be the ethics of the causes of the unhappy struggle in South Africa, it is clear that India to a considerable extent is moved by the Imperial spirit. I mean that spirit of Imperial Liberalism which makes for healthy progress in the arts of peace all over the broad dominions where waves the British flag, as opposed to that noisy brazen cult of which the so-called "empire builders" are the chief promoters. Heaven forbid that the Indians should ever catch the contagion of that sordid and unhealthful spirit which has already made so much advance in the path of sanguinary unrighteousness, and has demanded of peaceful England so many involuntary sacrifices.

The recent riot at Cawnpore has led to the publication of a Resolution by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces. It appears that the unhappy incident owes its origin mainly to the carelessness of the police, who failed to make the ignorant masses sufficiently conversant with the scope of the rules as regards plague. The rules referring to segregation either were not interpreted to them at all or else were misinterpreted. Anyhow it is plain that it was the enforcement of segregation by the police which brought about the collision between them and the mob. The Lieutenant-Governor has, in a spirit of fairness, not unaccompanied by sound common sense, poured oil over the troubled waters. Neither has he been slow in expressing his sense of displeasure as to the proceedings of the higher police authorities. But it is surprising that after such a declaration Sir Antony MacDonnell should have foisted on the town a punitive police which will cost about Rs. 50,000 for a year. This is hardly consonant with the other part of his policy. This police will only keep the wounds from healing. There will continue to prevail a kind of sullen feeling among the people at the injustice of this punishment. If the people at large were not at fault, why this police? If they did create a disturbance, there is his own confession that it is his police that were to be blamed for it. Then, I repeat, why this injustice? This is not the way to establish a truce of a permanent character. The incident shows how even the ablest and wisest of administrators is sometimes liable to commit a grievous error.

The scarcity of rupees has been the theme of a sober but strenuous remonstrance on the part of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce. About three months since, two of the exchange banks in Calcutta had to complain through this body to the Finance Department that they were not able to obtain the necessary quantity of rupees. The Government was obliged to admit its inability to furnish the required coins, but forthwith began coining rupees to the extent of about 1½ crores. It turns out that the Chamber has had to make another representation pointing out the fresh difficulty of two eminent firms in obtaining rupees and subsidiary coins. Messrs. Gillanders, Arbuthnot and Co. were unable to obtain from the Currency Office four-anna pieces required for payment of fractional wages to their operatives. Again, Messrs. Ralli Brothers could not get three lakhs of currency notes exchanged for rupees. The Currency Department pleaded the drain of these coins to famine-stricken areas. The Government, however, have promised to coin more rupees. Already silver has been purchased by the Secretary of State to the value of a million sterling. The Chamber further pointed out a similar difficulty experienced by merchants at Allahabad and Cawnpore. There neither notes nor gold sovereigns could be exchanged for rupees without a discount! The harm to the credit of the Government would be great were such currency conditions to prevail all over the country. Such a result must be avoided at all hazards. But what is the moral of this fact—scarcity of rupees and small coins, which are the backbone of the whole inland trade? What becomes of that precious theory of "redundancy"? Is it not clear that the opponents of that theory were in the right? And yet this redundancy was urged as one of the reasons for establishing a gold standard! The mints have been closed these seven years. The gold standard has been established these two years. The gold currency was introduced into the country wellnigh twelve months ago. And yet what has been the cumulative effect of these several measures on the course of silver? This only—that silver refuses to be driven out as the authors of the gold currency so keenly desire. Baffled, the Government stated through its Finance Minister in September last, and again at the time of the Budget, that "it was not hostile" to silver, and that it thought that for a long while to come the white metal must still be the medium of exchange throughout the country for trade as well as domestic economy. That was a confession of the failure of its new measure so far. The country's opinion is meanwhile as strong to-day as it was some years ago, that it is futile to convert the millions of rupee currency into a token currency. The facts are too strong for the Government. More than all the warnings of experienced men, conversant with the idiosyncracies of the people, this scarcity of rupees has shown how mistaken were those who light-heartedly embarked on the golden enterprise. The Government now affects to be "cautious." It replies to the Calcutta Chamber that it will coin another crore of rupees, and will coin more, to meet popular and trade requirements; and it relies on commercial bodies to co-operate! But will an addition to the extent of even a crore of rupees annually suffice for the growing wants of the country? If gold cannot come into popular use, if it must be limited to a few foreign transactions, then it stands to reason that with an annually expanding trade and an increasing population a crore is not likely to be enough. The average before the mints were closed was about seven crores, with half a crore in small coins. Is it possible that the country can do with anything short of five crores? We must wait and see. But the currency fallacies of the Indian Government are being slowly exploded, and it is thus becoming more and more apparent how great an error was the closure of the mints.

It is broadly stated that the Viceroy is engaged in disposing of the question of the separation of judicial from executive functions. The Indian Association has taken time by the forelock and memorialised the Government on the subject. The example set by that public-spirited body will no doubt be generally followed. Though there is now a considerable volume of most influential and authoritative opinion on the subject, there is needed a fresh representation from leading organisations, aided by the light of some of the most glaring instances in which Lord Curzon had to interpose his authority. In this connexion the *Statesman*, in its two issues of the 22nd and 23rd instant, has a good deal to say which is worthy of serious attention. The official theory is well known, but its hollowness has long since been made plain. And the *Statesman* observes that "Lord Curzon may fairly be credited with a logical mind as well as a wide knowledge of human nature, and with both these qualifications he can scarcely believe in his innermost consciousness that the lofty ideal is attainable under the conditions postulated" by the permanent bureaucracy. "It would be a counsel of perfection if even the average Indian official were much less tainted with bureaucratic prejudices than he is. It is not in ordinary human nature that a man combining executive and judicial functions should be able at will so to divide his mind as to prevent the objects which actuate him in the one capacity from more or less influencing it in the other." The *Statesman* so far has again rendered valuable service to India by its impartial and

independent advocacy of this crying reform. Indians have great faith in the honesty of purpose and the determined will of the Viceroy to do what is right, and entertain the hope that in this important matter he will not belie popular expectation, but will add one more instance of his courage and sympathy to the half-a-dozen he has already shown—instances which have won for him golden opinions and inspired the greatest confidence in him as a ruler who works for righteousness in British Indian administration. So let us all devoutly hope that his lordship will bind a fresh laurel to his brow by instituting this reform.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

5,802,000 ON RELIEF.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy on the subject of the famine :—

"Meteorological Reporter forecasts good, but late, monsoon. Good rain has fallen in Southern India and scattered showers elsewhere; otherwise hot weather conditions still prevail and famine relief situation unaltered. Numbers of persons in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 1,181,000; Punjab, 162,000; Central Provinces, 1,951,000; Berar, 444,000; Ajmere-Merwara, 144,000; Rajputana States, 516,000; Central India States, 201,000; Bombay Native States, 512,000; Baroda, 99,000; North-Western Provinces, 2,000; Punjab Native States, 36,000; Central Provinces Feudatory States, 68,000; Hyderabad, 461,000; Madras, 19,000; Kashmir, nil (*i.e.*, no return); Bengal, 6,000. Total, 5,802,000."

THE MANSION HOUSE FUND.

The Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Indian famine sufferers amounted on Wednesday night to £280,230. The Lord Mayor during the day remitted a further sum of £10,000 to Lord Curzon for relief purposes.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

Sir William Wedderburn has addressed the following letter to Mr. A. J. Wilson, editor of the *Investors' Review*, on the subject of the application of this Fund :—

To A. J. Wilson, Esq., *Investors' Review*.

Dear Sir,—In continuation of my former letter on the subject of the *Investors' Review* Famine Fund, I now write to say that our friends in Bombay have formed a small committee, of which Mr. Justice Ranade and the Hon. Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta are members, and that they have been very carefully considering the most effective way of applying the funds which your kind exertions have placed at their disposal. The enormous magnitude of the calamity and the millions of population affected render it difficult to make any wide distribution without frittering away the money; while, on the other hand, if substantial relief is given to individuals, such relief must necessarily be restricted to a small local area. This practical difficulty met the committee when they desired to carry out the special object suggested in the *Review*, viz., to replace the cultivators' plough cattle, and thus to give them a chance of recovering their ancient prosperity when the famine is over. No more useful or benevolent object could be proposed. But the mortality of cattle has been so excessive, in some districts amounting almost to extinction, that a very large sum would be required in order to afford any sensible relief. It appears also that the Government contemplates taking some serious action in this matter. Under these circumstances the Bombay Committee recommend that the course of events should be watched before spending money in this direction. In the meantime they suggest that a portion of the fund might be employed in subsidising two unsectarian orphanages which are undertaking the maintenance of famine children left helpless by the death or destitution of their parents. These institutions are well managed by independent unofficial committees, and minister to the needs of extensive districts. One is at Ahmedabad, in Gujerat, and is under the personal supervision of Mr. Lalshunker Umiashunker, Judge of the Court of Small Causes. It contains at present 700 children. The other is at Pandharpur, in the Dekkhan. Ordinarily these orphanages are maintained by local subscriptions, but the managers now need special help on account of the famine children thrown on their hands; and although they hope that some of these children will ultimately be claimed by relations and friends, the larger portion will remain as a burden on the institutions. Accordingly, the Bombay Committee recommend that a grant should be made from the *Investors' Review* Fund to these two orphanages; and we trust that, under the circumstances, this proposal will meet with your approval. The Bombay Committee at the same time desire me to say how deeply grateful they feel both for your vigorous and continued advocacy of Indian interests and for your present kindly action in enlisting British sympathy on behalf of their famine-stricken brethren.

Yours faithfully, W. Wedderburn.

Chairman, British Committee, Indian National Congress.

Meredith, Gloucester,
June 1, 1900.

Mr. Wilson, writing in the *Investors' Review* (June 9), expresses the opinion that "no better destination could be provided." He adds :—

We feel something like shame, though, on reading the words of thanks addressed to us by Sir William on behalf of the Indian Committee that has consented to deal with the distribution of the money; it is such a tiny sum. But we have recognised all along how difficult it is to get people in this country to believe that people of any other race, particularly of any race under their sway, can do any good thing. We have arrived at such a perfect belief in our own excellence, that no room is left in our minds for appreciation of the good qualities those not of us may display. It was because this feeling is so dominant that we have insisted on putting the money given into our hands under the control of Native gentlemen. We are not only fully satisfied that these custodians will do their duty as unselfishly as the noblest English missionary could be expected to do it, but that they can distribute what funds are placed in their hands with an intelligent appreciation of the circumstances and wants of the people assisted exceeding the knowledge of any European.

Moreover, we know on the best of testimony that a good deal of the money subscribed through Mansion House funds and the like, often from motives we shall not enquire into, but assume to be the most excellent, is wasted, falling into hands careless about its distribution, and ultimately in part disappearing without reaching the poor wretches whom it was doubtless, when the cheques were written, intended to benefit. The good will and conscience of the givers, in short, pass not beyond the act of bestowal. Because of this failure of English generosity to accomplish the intended good in many instances, we thought it well to try how far our countrymen and women would assist us in extending the hand of friendship, with a little money in it, towards the distressed natives of India through a channel that would at least mean a break with old traditions, and the setting of a fashion calculated to bring the Natives and us into sympathetic contact. From this point of view our little fund has perhaps been less of a failure than it looks. We, at any rate, are deeply grateful to the not inconsiderable number of readers who have come so kindly to our assistance, and are not without hope that many more may yet be found to aid us when they realise how hopeless the condition of Central India and Bombay is.

We take also the following from the current issue (June 9) of the *Investors' Review* :—

Subjoined is the list and amount of subscriptions received for our little fund up to date. May we again repeat that it is a fund, every farthing of which will be put to good uses, especially in helping the starved cultivators to replace their lost cattle, and that the more help we can give in this direction the sooner will the distressed provinces and Native States—for they cannot be forgotten in the present misery—recover some of their ancient prosperity? Cheques and postal orders should be drawn to A. J. Wilson, crossed Union Bank of London, Famine Fund Account.

List of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Amount acknowledged last week	£581	1	0
J. W. Stove, Esq., Stromness	0	5	0
Arthur Brooke, Esq., London, S.W.	10	10	0
Indian Majlis, Cambridge	12	9	0
"In Memoriam," London, E.C.	10	0	0
Total to date	£614	5	0

Remittances should be made to Mr. A. J. Wilson, *Investors' Review* office, Norfolk House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W.C.

AN INDIAN THEATRICAL ENTERTAINMENT.

On behalf of the Indians in London, Dr. Mullick, we learn, is organising a matinée at Her Majesty's Theatre (date not yet fixed), the proceeds of which are to go to the Famine Fund. A large and distinguished Committee, including prominent Indians and Anglo-Indians, has been formed, with Dr. Mullick as chairman, and Mr. N. B. Wagle and Mr. J. M. Parikh as secretaries. Sir Henry Irving, Mr. Beerbohm Tree, and other leading artistes, have willingly promised their services. The Prince of Wales has engaged a box, and is expected to be present; and a long list of nobility and gentry have expressed their intention of supporting the benevolent project. We hope the entertainment will bring a substantial addition to the Famine Fund.

APPEAL BY THE VICEROY.
LETTER TO THE LORD MAYOR.

The Lord Mayor has received (June 11) the following communication from Lord Curzon of Kedleston :—

Viceregal Lodge, Simla, May 23, 1900.

My Dear Lord Mayor,—We in India owe so much to you for your initiative—most promptly and generously followed by Lord Mayors

and Mayors in other cities and boroughs of the United Kingdom—in starting at the Mansion House a branch of our Indian Famine Relief Fund, that I should like to send to you some account of the present condition of affairs, and of the purposes to which the liberal, but yet not too liberal, contributions that have so far reached us from home are being put. Such an account may serve as an unsolicited reward of conscience to those who have already subscribed, and may perhaps act as an incentive to others who, from ignorance of the extent of our needs, or of the great value of their donations, however humble, have not yet responded to your appeal.

The statements that have appeared in the Press, both from the Secretary of State and myself, will already have acquainted the British public with the fact that we are struggling with a famine greater in its intensity over the areas afflicted than any previously recorded visitation. I say greater, because, though fewer persons will, as I hope, die in this famine than in any previous drought, yet incomparably more persons are suffering, and are only being saved from death by the combined exertions of Government and of private effort, and because the loss of crops and cattle, amounting to an almost complete denudation of the stricken area, are immeasurably greater in the present instance than in any previously recorded affliction.

It will be remembered in England that not dissimilar statements were made in respect of the famine of three years ago, which excited such widespread interest and provoked such a munificent response from all parts of the English-speaking world. How far the present position transcends that of 1897 may, however, be demonstrated by the following facts. The average annual rainfall of the Indian continent, calculated upon data extending over the last thirty years, is 41 inches. In 1896 the deficiency was 5 inches. In 1899 (when the monsoon broke that regulated the harvests of 1900) the deficiency was 11 inches, or 27 per cent. Such a deficit is unparalleled in Indian records. In the middle of May, 1897, an area of 205,000 square miles, with a population of 40,000,000 persons, was affected. In the middle of May, 1900, the figures are 417,000 square miles (or nearly one quarter of the entire extent of the Indian empire, and 54,000,000 persons. In May, 1897, 3,811,000 persons were in receipt of Government relief; in May, 1900, the total relieved is 5,607,000. At the present moment, if we take the whole of the afflicted regions in British India, 15 per cent. of the entire population are being supported by Government (in many parts the proportion is nearly double); while the figures for Native States, which amount only to 6 per cent., will give an idea both of the anxiety with which we interpret our own obligations, and of the need for further assistance in parts of the country, which are not less suffering, but over whose administration we exercise a less immediate or perfect control. Nevertheless, while in the middle of May, 1897, we had received a sum of £700,000 from the generosity of our fellow-subjects in the United Kingdom, up to the corresponding date in 1900 there has come from the same sources the sum of £370,000.

The special features which differentiate the present famine from its predecessors, other than those already described, are the absolute failure of the two last autumn and spring harvests, than which it is impossible to imagine anything more ruinous or complete, and the unprecedented loss of cattle in the central and western parts of India, which will render the task of recuperation more arduous than on any previous occasion.

The test of mortality is one to which, for the purposes of comparison, I gladly and even proudly abstain from referring, since the result of our efforts has been, so far, to reduce the figures on the present occasion to a lower level than has ever previously been attained. In many of the worst districts, such as the Central Provinces, the figures show but a slight excess over the normal rates. In other, but isolated, areas, where the distress is acute, where thousands of destitute immigrants from Native States have streamed across the boundary, and where cholera and other diseases have attacked the frames already emaciated by privation, the death-rate is abnormally high. In some of the Native States it is, I am afraid, shocking. In the total area of destitution many thousands of persons must inevitably succumb, if not to positive starvation, at any rate to the debility that is scarcely distinguishable therefrom.

If the question be asked, Why is Government not able to assume the entire burden, and to dispense with all external aid? no false pride need deter me from giving a frank reply. Government is straining every nerve, is pouring out its money, is shrinking from no obligation, however severe. From October, 1899, the beginning of the famine, until December, 1900, we anticipate that we shall have spent $5\frac{1}{4}$ millions sterling upon direct relief, 2 millions upon suspensions and remissions of Land Revenue, $1\frac{1}{4}$ millions upon advances (that will, in many cases, never be recovered) for the purchase of seed and cattle, $\frac{3}{4}$ million upon loans to distressed Native States. But over and above this expenditure, which cripples our development in a score of ways, there lies a vast area of need which, do what we may, we can barely reach, and in which extraneous contributions supply an invaluable reinforcement. I may instance the relief of the aged and infirm, of sick patients in the hospitals, of children and orphans, of those men and women who will endure almost any privation sooner than submit themselves to the quasi-publicity of Government relief. This is a field of enormous and almost undiscoverable extent, the margin of which the already over-worked official hardly touches, but which is, in a peculiar and inevitable degree, the property of individual effort and private generosity.

Already the Famine Relief Committee has dispensed, with an admirable promptitude, the sum of over £500,000; and, fast as the money may come in, not more swiftly is it diverted and distributed into the various channels of relief. Here we have no cast-iron or official system. The unit of relief organisation is the District Committee, in which the non-official element almost invariably predominates. Officials and non-officials, Europeans and Natives, Christian missionaries and orthodox Brahmans—we welcome the co-operation of all, since all are enlisted in the same catholic service of the relief of human suffering.

I should add that many of the British Colonies and outlying stations of British influence or commerce, among which I may especially mention the Straits Settlements and China, are coming liberally to our assistance. The generosity of Germany, acting upon the noble initiative of the German Emperor, has already been recorded; while the latest news that reaches me testifies to a similar outburst of practical sympathy in the United States of America.

It occurs to me that a resumé of our needs, and of our proceedings up to date, such as I have here supplied, may be of assistance to your lordship in your appeal to British munificence. The old friends of India, the great business houses, and many a congregation and individual have rallied splendidly to our aid. But there must also be many a man and woman in Great Britain and Ireland whose heart has perhaps not yet fully awakened to the glories and responsibilities of our Indian Empire, or who is not wholly aware of the extremity of our need who can yet, from a modest competence, spare a few pounds—in some cases it may even be less—and who may, in so doing, feel the honourable satisfaction of having assisted to save from the saddest of deaths, and to start again in what is at no time the brightest of lives, our suffering fellow-subjects and fellow-creatures in the Indian Empire of the Queen.—I am, my dear Lord Mayor, yours faithfully,

CURZON OF KEDLESTON.

To the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor,
Mansion House, London.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

THE MINORITY REPORT.

The following is the text of the Minority Report (which is signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine) concluded from page 279 of our last issue:—

3. That there is a faulty distribution of expenditure of Indian money—

(*a*) Comparatively more is spent on so-called national defence, and less on the material and moral development of the country and the improvement of the civil administration;

(*b*) More is spent on Imperial purposes and less on provincial purposes than is desirable in the present circumstances of the country, the provincial purposes being intimately connected, and the Imperial purposes only remotely, with the immediate well-being of the people;

(*c*) More is spent on improvement of communications, and less on the improvement of the condition and capacity of the people themselves.

The present scale of India's expenditure is also open generally to objection on the ground that it is much beyond the capacity of the country to bear.

III.—Apportionment of Charge.

92. In dealing with the principles (*ante* para. 18) upon which a settlement of this question should be based, we assumed that it is the desire of the British people that British rule should be one of justice and righteousness, for
Q. 13,642. the benefit of both India and Britain, and not for the benefit of Britain alone at the expense of India. Guided
Q. 17,014. by this desire, the apportionment both of burdens and benefits will follow the analogy of two partners jointly interested, and not that of master and slave. When, therefore, we come to make practical suggestions,
Q. 6,501, 8,683, 17,819. we have to ascertain what are the purposes in which both are interested, and what proportional share of those interests belongs to each? With a view to a truly equitable settlement between them, some reasonable
Q. 16,283. consideration should also be given to the capacity of each to sustain the financial burden, England being very rich, and India very poor. Now, as regards the question, what are the joint interests, the first point is that the maintenance of British rule in India is probably the greatest of our Imperial interests. To use the words of the present Viceroy, Lord Curzon: "India was the pivot of our Empire. If this Empire lost any other part of its dominions we could survive, but if we lost India the sun of our Empire would be set."[1] It seems, therefore, clear that the Empire should bear at least a share of those expenses which are necessary to
Q. 14,289. maintain the conditions without which British rule in India would not be possible. What those conditions are was very distinctly laid down by Lord Kimberley, speaking at the Mansion House (*v. Times* of June 13, 1893).
App. D., para. 10. This is what he said: "There is one point upon which I imagine, whatever may be our party politics in this country, we are all united: that we are resolutely determined to maintain our supremacy over our Indian Empire. That, I conceive, is a matter about which we have only one opinion, and let me tell you that that supremacy rests upon three distinct bases. One of these bases, and a very important one, is the loyalty and goodwill of the Native princes and population over whom we rule. Next, and not less important,

[1] *Times*, 3/12/98.

is the maintenance of our European Civil Service, upon which rests the foundation of our administration in India. Last, not because it is the least, but because I wish to give it the greatest importance, we rest also upon the magnificent European force which we maintain in that country, and the splendid army of Native auxiliaries by which that force is supported." From this it appears that the main instruments by which British rule in India is maintained, are, a strong European military force; a European Civil Service; and a contented Indian population. Without these combined factors the conditions necessary to British rule could not be produced. The maintenance of these instruments of British rule is therefore clearly an Imperial interest, and we are of opinion that the Imperial Exchequer should bear a proper share of the expense involved. Qq. 5,345, 9,612-3.

93. The next question is, What is a proper share? Now, in dealing with this question, we fully recognise the advantage to India from the maintenance of law and order, and provision against foreign aggression. Also we do not wish to minimise the political and educational benefits arising to India from the British connexion, so far as she has been made partaker of free and progressive institutions. If we did so, we should not give true expression to Indian sentiment. It would indeed be difficult to exaggerate the deep feeling of gratitude which exists for the truly British boons of a free press, free public meetings, municipal institutions, trial by jury, and higher education. In proportion as these and similar boons have been extended or withdrawn, so does enlightened Indian opinion measure the benefits accruing to India from the British connexion, as contrasted with a possible similar connexion with any other country in the world. So strong is this feeling that we do not hesitate to say that if, in accordance with our pledges, the Indians were made full partakers of true British citizenship, they would regard the maintenance of British supremacy as among the first and best of India's interests. On the other hand, if the British connexion means, the withdrawal of these boons, on grounds of distrust, the increased substitution of British for Indian agency, and vast military expenditure in support of British Imperial policy, then, from the Indian point of view, the benefits of the British connexion are largely reduced and much injury is inflicted. Qq. 19,833-7.

94. From these considerations it will be evident how difficult it is to appraise definitely the proportional advantage to India and to the Empire from the maintenance of law and order in India, and her protection from foreign aggression. But one distinguishing mark and test of the British interest is indicated in Lord Kimberley's declaration, viz., the employment of European agency in the Civil and Military Services. This is the Imperial requirement already referred to as the "irreducible minimum." For if we imagine a great Indian-born ruler like Akbar, it is evident that he would only employ Europeans in certain special cases, relying upon the abundant supply of experience, intelligence, and warlike qualities to be found in India, for the ordinary defence and administration of the country.

95. Taking, therefore, the employment of Europeans as a fair practical test of Imperial requirements, we propose, as a working arrangement, that Britain should pay for all British employed upon Indian work in Britain; that India should pay for all Indians employed in India; and that, as regards British employed in India, and Indians employed in Britain, there should be a compromise under which the expenses should be shared equally. Or, to make the British share still more moderate, the cost of all European agency on behalf of India, wherever employed, might be divided half and half between India and the Imperial Exchequer. The British taxpayer would thus, equally with the Indian taxpayer, become interested in checking the excessive employment of a costly imported agency, and a useful spirit of enquiry would be aroused in this country with reference to the efficiency and economy of the Indian administration. We believe that the British taxpayer would, in the end, be more than recouped for his sacrifice by the prosperity of the 300 millions of India, and the consequent enormous trade which would thence accrue to the United Kingdom. Qq. 5,345, 16,505, 16,404, 19,419, 19,800. App. D., para. 14. Qq. 17,014 17,821, 19,320.

96. Such being the arrangement we propose with regard to the ordinary expenses of Indian defence and administration, we come next to the special cost of wars carried on beyond the Indian frontier of 1858. With regard to the last Afghan war, Lord Salisbury declared that it formed "an indivisible part of a great Imperial question." If this is a correct statement—and we believe that it is—it follows that the whole cost, ordinary and extraordinary, of such wars should primarily be borne by the Imperial Exchequer, India contributing in proportion to the benefit accruing to her from the protection of her frontier or other circumstances arising out of the war. On the other hand, the disadvantages to her should not be lost sight of, such as the great destruction of cattle and other transport animals, and the increasing difficulty and expense of recruitment for the Native army, on account of the dislike to service outside of India. This arrangement would apply to wars carried on in the immediate vicinity of India. But in the case of wars carried on in distant parts, such as Abyssinia, the Sudan, Egypt, East Africa, or the Cape, no expenditure should be placed upon India, either ordinary or extraordinary. On the contrary, the great convenience experienced in each of these cases from being able to draw on Indian resources must be reckoned as an important credit item in the account between India and the Imperial Exchequer. The only case in which, perhaps, an exception might be made is when the Suez Canal is actually threatened and may have to be actually defended. India might then be called upon for a contribution, provided always that other British colonies and dependencies in Australia and the Far East—which similarly benefit from the Suez Canal—also pay their share. App. D., para. 31. Qq. 5352-3. Q. 6,129. Qq. 5,355, 6,117, 6,125-7, 6,623. Q. 17,074.

97. But, in balancing the account of war expenditure as between India and the Imperial Exchequer, we cannot overlook the great sums charged in times past improperly upon India on account of wars waged beyond the Indian frontier, for purposes avowedly Imperial. What the grand total on account of Afghan and other wars amounts to it is difficult to estimate. But we may draw attention to the calculations made by Colonel Hanna ("Backwards and Forwards," p. 40), showing an estimate of over Rx. 70,000,000 (Appendix I.). From official returns it appears that nearly Rx. 13,000,000 were spent from April, 1882, to March, 1892, on minor wars beyond the Western and North-Western frontiers. There was also the last Burmese war.[1] The cost of all these wars, including the first Afghan war (1838-42), has (in spite of protest[2]) been placed upon India, with the exception of £5,000,000 granted by the Imperial Treasury towards the cost of second Afghan war. App. D., para. 44. Qq. 5,347-9. Qq. 17,821. 18,514, 19,047. Qq. 5,353-4, 6,180-1, 6,197.

98. For all these wars, so far as they were "an indivisible part of a great Imperial question," the Imperial Exchequer should primarily have paid. But the charges were all thrown upon India, imposing upon her a public debt which she need not otherwise have incurred. It may we hope not seem even now too late to ask for such refund as equity requires. But some relief would be afforded to India if, in bearing her share in this Imperial burden, she had the help of the Imperial credit. Had the Imperial guarantee been granted at the time the Indian debt was incurred, a vast sum would have been saved to India. But even now this concession would go some way to lighten the load imposed upon India in creating and maintaining British Imperial supremacy in the East. Q. 18,514. App. B., para. 129.

99. We are strongly of opinion that India ought no longer to bear the heavy financial strain of 75,000 British troops.[3] At the present time about 10,000 of these troops have been withdrawn from India for employment in the Transvaal war, while 5,000 Native troops have also been withdrawn to replace British soldiers transferred from Ceylon, Mauritius, and Singapore for employment in South Africa. If in a time of war, when the strain is great on the Empire, it is considered safe to withdraw 15,000 troops from India, it is clear that, on a peace footing, the number of British troops may be safely reduced by 20,000 men. We do not recommend their withdrawal from India, where they should continue to be quartered, but equity requires that the revenues of India should be relieved of their entire charges, and that they should be treated as part of the reserve forces of the Eastern portion of the British Empire generally, and borne in future upon the army estimates in that capacity.

100. With regard to the dispute between the War Office and the Government of India, Lord Northbrook's Committee fixed the capitation grant for the training of European recruits at £7 10s.; and Lord Northbrook in his evidence said (Q. 14,295), "that this Commission may assume that on the whole our conclusions on the arithmetical question are fair to both sides." And in reply to (Q. 14,266) he said, "Yes, we then having got all the returns we wanted, and having got the claims for 1886-7, and 1887-8, arrived at a rate of £7 10s. upon the establishment of the British troops in India, which we recommended as being what we considered a fair charge. That was the result of the Commission." The Government of India claims a reduction to £5; but our colleagues have retained the charge at £7 10s. If this be accepted, then according to the principles above enunciated, this charge for European agency, being one in which both countries are interested, should be borne in equal shares by the two countries, the contribution from India being thus £3 15s. Similarly as regards the Navy. The charge is incurred directly for joint purposes in the Indian waters. It should, therefore, Qq. 6,195-6 6,045-6.

[1] Protest against Burmese War, Indian National Congress, 1885, Resolution VII.

[2] Extract resolution at a General Court of the East Indian Company, on June 27, 1842, (Sir George Wingate's pamphlet "Our Financial Relations," 1859, p. 32).

[3] Protest Resolution V., Indian National Congress, 1885.

be fairly divided between India and the Imperial Exchequer. And in this connexion it must be pointed out that all the advantages of service in the Royal Navy are reserved for British born subjects. On this account either Qq. 6,594, 9,606-12. Indians, according to their qualifications, should be allowed to participate in the honours and emoluments of the service, or else a corresponding reduction should be made in the payment required from India. We Qq. 7,130-4. regret that (as shown in Appendix H) the Admiralty excludes Indians from service in the Royal Navy.

101. With reference to minor expenses, such as Aden, diplomatic and consular establishments, subsidies, etc., east of the Red Sea, we are willing to accept the view taken by our colleagues. But we think that in all cases where British colonies and dependencies in Australia and the Far East are also interested, they should be required to pay their share. The self-governing colonies have recently shown a strong desire to identify themselves with Imperial interests, and even to share in the burdens; and we are of opinion that if, under these circumstances, they are unwilling to con- Q. 9,541. tribute to the charges now in question, and if the Imperial Government is not prepared to insist upon its claim, it would be unbecoming to make an exception in the case of India, and to exact from her a contribution in disregard of her protest.

102. Another minor point has reference to the ownership of Qq. 12,026, 12,035, 12,037. buildings, such as the India Office and the Royal Engineering College, which have been built in England at India's expense. These are for joint purposes; and it might even be claimed that British subjects are more interested in them than Indian subjects. They are property situated in this country; and we note that the Colonial Office was built entirely at the expense of the British Exchequer. We think, however, that it would be sufficient if the cost were equally divided, and a corresponding refund conceded.

103. The recommendations regarding apportionment above submitted depend, in great measure, upon our reading of the Commission's terms of reference, and as we differ from our colleagues in this matter, we have thought it desirable to record our views regarding this part of the reference somewhat in detail. These will be found in Appendix D.

104. In certain cases doubtful points will arise as to respective interests; and it seems desirable to refer Q. 13,642. such cases for decision to some fair tribunal. The following suggestions are respectfully submitted for consideration.

105. Upon this question valuable evidence has been taken; and the Commission seems called on to make some definite suggestions regarding it, out of deference to the wish expressed by the Prime Minister not long after the Commission was appointed. The proposal to establish an arbitration tribunal between India and Great Britain, in order to settle disputes regarding the apportionment of charges between the two countries, was first brought into prominence by Mr. Arthur Balfour in the debate, in 1896, on Suakin in the House of Commons. He then asked "whether the time has not arrived when we might with advantage, both to India and to England, constitute some kind of tribunal of arbitration . . . . for the determination of questions of this sort, in which the interests of India and Great Britain should be alike and equally represented." This general suggestion was brought into the sphere of practical politics by Lord Salisbury when, in the House of Lords, he stated that early in the year he was "so impressed in favour of such a course that he laid before his colleagues a proposal for the appointment of a tribunal, which should be so impartially composed as to obtain the confidence of the taxpayers of both England and India." When, however, they came to consider the details, they felt that it would be best to await the report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. And Lord Salisbury expressed a hope that that Commission "will furnish suggestions for regulations to which the Government of the day may be able to conform without any fear that the steps which they may think necessary for the defence of the Empire will be made the subject of discussions which may be injurious to the interests of that Empire." The idea was also approved by Lord Northbrook, who thought that a promise by Q. 14,305. Government to constitute such an authority would entirely counteract the ill-feeling raised in India by the unhappy Suakin business; while Lord Lansdowne Q. 16,033. considered that some machinery might be devised which would enable her Majesty's Government and the Indian Government so to apply the principles of reciprocity that India would be placed for the future "in an infinitely sounder position with regard to these controversies than she had ever before occupied."

106. The point to consider is how such a tribunal shall be found as, in the words of Lord Salisbury, will "obtain the confidence of the taxpayers of both England and India"? It is in such cases generally better, if possible, to utilise an existing machinery, especially if that machinery is one of proved efficiency and accepted authority, rather than to constitute a new tribunal. And, in our opinion, there is no authority in England which more commands the confidence of the Indian public as regards wisdom and strict Q. 18,767. impartiality than the Judicial Committee of her Majesty's Privy Council. Fortunately, the Statute 3 and 4 William IV, c. 41, which defines the functions of the Judicial Committee, not only provides that it shall hear judicial appeals under section 3, but also under section 4, authorises Qq. 15,691, 13,651. it to entertain any other matter whatsoever upon a special reference by the Crown. Section 4 runs as follows: "That it shall be lawful for his Majesty to refer to the said Judicial Committee, for hearing or consideration, any such other matters whatsoever, as his Majesty shall think fit; and such Committee shall thereupon hear and consider the same." And Lord Justice Knight Bruce, in the case of the Nawab of Surat (Moore's Appeals, vol. v, p. 499), observed with reference to these very wide powers, that if "it shall hereafter be the pleasure of her Majesty to refer the present petition, or any similar petition to their Lordships, their Lordships will, of course, hear it, and report to her Majesty upon it." And, in disposing of the particular case, he pointed out to the petitioners how they might get the benefit of section 4: "The petitioners, therefore, will take such course as they may be advised, with reference to an application to the Crown, through the Board of Control or otherwise. By possibility, in consequence of such application, if made, the matter may come here again, and their Lordships will readily do their duty in hearing it."

107. As it is desired in this matter to provide a tribunal which will not only be impartial but will command the confidence of both British and Indian taxpayers; as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council fulfils these conditions; as the Statute provides that the Crown can refer to it any such matters whatsoever as her Majesty shall think fit; and as their Lordships are prepared readily to hear such matters on the merits, and to report to her Majesty; there seems no reason why any question in dispute between India and Great Britain should not be so dealt with. One great advantage would be that upon the difficult and delicate questions that would thus come before the Judicial Committee the case for each side could be argued by counsel, and the recommendation which would be laid before both Houses of Parliament would carry with it all the authority of a judicial decision by an absolutely independent tribunal. The issues in dispute would be mainly of a judicial kind, such as in the present case, as to where the interest of India ends and the interest of England begins, but if financial matters of a difficult kind were involved an assessor could easily be added, specially qualified to deal with such questions. It would also be well that for such arbitrations an Indian judge should be included in the Judicial Committee. This would be a step towards the equal representation of Indian and British interests, as desired by Mr. Arthur Balfour. On receiving the report of the Judicial Committee, it would, of course, be open to both Houses of Parliament to discuss and decide regarding it, but there would lie upon anyone objecting to the recommendation a heavy burden to show that the award should not be accepted; and as the recommendation would not come from either political party, there would be no reason why the debate should assume a party complexion or be in any way injurious to the interests of the Empire.

108. In conclusion, we would draw special attention to the Report of 1874 on Indian Finance by a Select Committee of the House of Commons. That Committee expressed its agreement with the opinion of Lord Salisbury, who said that "the most effectual way of securing financial justice for India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf." The question is, how can this constant Qq. 8,016-7. Q. 18,023. watchfulness be ensured? The only way seems to be by obtaining in the House of Commons the presence of representatives of the Indian taxpayers. This opens up a large constitutional question, upon which we are not prepared now to enter. But it is to be observed that French India has her representatives in the Chamber of Deputies; and we are of opinion that one representative from each of the Presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, would be found of great practical value in the House of Commons; while such a concession would give profound satisfaction to public opinion in India.

109. We desire to associate ourselves with our colleagues in their cordial acknowledgment of the services of Mr. Colin Campbell, the secretary of the Commission.

W. WEDDERBURN.
DADABHAI NAOROJI.

While I am unable to agree with some of the arguments and conclusions brought forward in the Report and Appendices by Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, I agree with the recommendations, and append my signature thereto.

W. S. CAINE.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN BOOK.—No. III.

The Proposed Separation
OF
Judicial and Executive Duties in India.

MEMORIAL
FROM

RT. HON. LORD HOBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.
(late Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD GARTH, Q.C.
(late Chief Justice of Bengal).

RT. HON. SIR RICHARD COUCH
(late Chief Justice of Bengal, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council).

SIR CHARLES SARGENT
(late Chief Justice of Bombay.)

SIR WILLIAM MARKBY, K.C.I.E.
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta).

SIR JOHN BUDD PHEAR
(late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, and Chief Justice of Ceylon).

SIR JOHN SCOTT, K.C.M.G.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).

SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.
(late Judge of the High Court, Bombay).

SIR ROLAND K. WILSON, BART.
(late Reader in Indian Law at the University of Cambridge).

MR. HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
(late Member of the Bengal Legislative Council).

TOGETHER WITH TWO APPENDICES.

LONDON: PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Price One Shilling (or 12 annas), postage 2d. extra.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, N.W.

To Political Associations, Literary Societies, Ethical Societies,
Etc., etc.

LECTURES and ADDRESSES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress (84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.), is now making arrangements for lectures and addresses on Indian questions during the Autumn and Winter Season.

Associations or individuals that desire the services of thoroughly competent speakers on Indian questions are requested to communicate as early as may be with the Secretary to the British Committee at the above address.

For a limited number of lectures lantern slides can be provided.

No charge will be made for the services of speakers with whom engagements are made through the British Committee.

Address, *THE SECRETARY,*
BRITISH COMMITTEE of the
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, *Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.*

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

"THE LAWYER."

A MONTHLY legal publication containing a full index of all recent important cases decided by the four High Courts, the Chief Court of Punjab, Sindh Sadar Court, Oudh and Central Provinces commissioners, Royal Courts of Justice in England in all Branches, the Privy Council, House of Lords; and reported in the (1-4) **Indian Law Reports Series**; (5) **the Calcutta Weekly Notes**; (6) **The Bombay Law Reporter**; (7) **Madras Law Journal**; (8) **Allahabad Weekly Notes**; (9) **Sindh Sadar Court Reports**; (10) **Punjab Law Reporter**; (11) **Central Provinces Reports**; (12) **Oudh select cases**; (13-15) **Law Reports (Q. B., Ch., A. C.)**; (16) **Indian Appeals and non-legal publications as the Times of India and other Indian Publications.** Legal news, anecdotes about Lawers, Scraps, **Statutory changes.** In short, in a small compass, the Journal gives the greatest information to Lawyers. In addition to this, interesting and important cases, old and new, are given *in extenso* with separate paging. **Price Rs. 4 only, inclusive of postage.** For specimen copies apply to the MANAGER, *The Lawyer*, Ahmedabad.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.